

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants amend the Application and seek re-consideration in view of the following remarks. In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 7-8, 12, 15, 20-21, 25, and 27, cancel claims 6 and 19, and add new claims 28-29. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-18, and 20-29 are pending in the Application.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 7, 20, and 27 stand objected to because it appears to the Patent Office that these claims should depend from claims 6, 19, and 15, respectively. Applicants have cancelled claims 6 and 19, and have amended claims 1 and 15 to recite the elements of claims 6 and 19. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 20 recite proper dependencies as they currently stand. In addition, Applicants have amended claim 27 to depend from claim 15 instead of from claim 1 to correct the typographical error. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claims 7, 20, and 27.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reciting insufficient antecedent basis for the terms, “said first output signal.” Applicants have amended the terms “a second output signal” in line 7 of claim 1 to read, “a first output signal” to correct such antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 12-17, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236600 filed by Silvester (“*Silvester*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, at least in view of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 15.

The Patent Office indicated that claims 6 and 19 would be allowable if they were re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (*see Paper No./Mail Date 20070531*, page 7). Applicants submit that, as amended, independent claims 1 and 15 are claims 6 and 19 re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4 and 12-14 depend from claim 1 include all of the elements thereof. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-4 and 12-14 are also in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, claims 16-17 and 25-27 depend from claim 15 include all of the elements thereof. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 16-17 and 25-27 are also in condition for allowance.

IV. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 10-11, 18, and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Silvester* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,355 issued to Obradovich ("*Obradovich*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, at least in view of the amendments to independent claims 1 (from which claims 5 and 10-11 depend) and 15 (from which claims 18 and 23-24 depend).

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 15 are in condition for allowance. Claims 5 and 10-11 depend from claim 1, and claims 18 and 23-24 depend from claim 15. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 5, 10-11, 18, and 23-24 are also in condition for allowance.

V. New Claims

Applicants add new claims 28 and 29. Applicants submit that claims 28 and 29 are novel over the art cited by the Patent Office.

Application No.: 10/809,058
Reply to Office Action mailed on 6/18/2007
Reply dated 08/29/2007

VI. Miscellaneous

Applicants have amended claims 7, 12, 20, and 25 so that the antecedent basis of various elements are consistent with their respective independent claims.

VII. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 6-9 and 19-22 would be allowable if re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above, Applicants have cancelled claims 6 and 19 and amended independent claims 1 and 15 to recite the elements of claims 6 and 19, respectively. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 15 are claims 6 and 19 re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit independent claims 1 and 15 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 2-5, 7-18, and 20-27 are in condition for allowance because of their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 15.

Application No.: 10/809,058
Reply to Office Action mailed on 6/18/2007
Reply dated 08/29/2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (480) 385-5060 or jgraff@ifllaw.com.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2007

/JASON R. GRAFF/
Jason R. Graff
Reg. No. 54,134